

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 550

RC 007 259

AUTHOR Chavers, Dean
TITLE The Indian College Student in California:
1967-1972.
INSTITUTION California State Coll., Hayward.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 24p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *American Indians; Budgeting; *College Bound
Students; College Curriculum; Enrollment Trends;
*Higher Education; Recruitment; *Student College
Relationship; *Student Needs; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *California; Native American Studies Program

ABSTRACT

The document is a report of the American Indians in higher education in California. Some 2,400 Indian students are expected to enroll in the academic year 1972-73, at some 55 or more colleges and universities in California. To serve the special needs of the Indian population, \$1,047,500 was allocated for some 19 of these institutions. This figure includes staff salaries for faculty, curriculum development, counseling, recruiting, and financial aids officers. Despite the impressive growth in numbers of Indian students, faculty, support services, curriculum, and budget, though, the total commitment of higher education institutions to the Indian student is not nearly adequate to meet their needs. Topics of discussion include: (1) the Indian student; (2) Budget: what share does the Indian get? (3) Native American Studies; (4) Areas for further research--dropout rate, success of Indian students in relation to Indian-oriented curriculum, skills needed on California Indian reservations, etc.; and (5) 4 appendixes--arriving at the figures, selected statistics, reasons for dropout, and staff totals.
(FF)

ED 081550

NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES PROGRAM

California State College, Hayward

25800 Hillary Street
Hayward, California 94542

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY



THE INDIAN COLLEGE STUDENT IN CALIFORNIA: 1967-1972

Enrollment and Support

Contents

Summary and Introduction	2
The Indian Student	5
Budgets: What share does the Indian get?	12
Native American Studies	14
Areas for Further Research	16

Appendix I: Arriving at the Figures

Appendix II: Selected Statistics

Appendix III: Reasons for Dropout

Appendix IV: Staff Totals

List of institutions and staff people, telephones, and addresses

Dean Chavers
Assistant Professor
Native American Studies

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RC 007259

I. SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION

The Native American in higher education in California is a recent phenomenon. Some 2400 Indian students are expected for the academic year 1972-73, at some 55 or more colleges and universities around the state, to be enrolled in higher education (as opposed to vocational training). This represents an increase of 2300% in the past five years, from a total of about 92 in 10 colleges in 1967-68.¹

To serve the special needs of this college population, only \$1,047,500 was allocated for some 19 of 55 institutions surveyed. This figure includes staff salaries for faculty, curriculum development, counseling, recruiting, and financial aids officers serving the needs of Indian students. This figure is a phenomenal increase over the comparable allocation for the state as a whole in 1967-68 -- \$11,000. But of this \$1.047 million total, some \$394,287 was for four specially funded federal training projects, and so benefited the Indian student in higher education little; only one of the four, an Indian teacher training project, was involved directly in higher education. When these projects are disregarded, the balance of \$653,213 averages to just \$11,876 per school surveyed, or about the equivalent of one staff position.

1

This report, while comprehensive, is by no means thorough. Due to time pressures and limited resources, an adequate job of surveying could not be done. But with the resources at hand, the job done was adequate enough to show the trend, and was also adequate enough in computing large gross totals. See Appendix I for a discussion of the limitations imposed upon this survey.

Dropout rates reported ranged from 10% to 90%. When the overall number of dropouts for 11 schools reporting was compared to the total number of students enrolled, this figure was about 15%. But the data are not adequate to guess the true dropout rate. Intuitively, 15% seems very low. The dominant reasons given by officials surveyed were lack of finances and lack of support for Indian students by the school administration.

There exist some 18 "departments" for Indian-oriented classes, ranging from B. A. granting full departments to sub-units housed in Anthropology departments, Black or Chicano studies departments, or others. One institution has two different "departments." Three are specialized programs, and 15 are general in nature. They, and financial aids, counseling, recruiting, and librarianship, are staffed with some 57 full-time staff people, supported by some 33 part-time staff, many of whom are College Work Study students.

In 1972-73 they will list some 278 or more course offerings on Native American studies, compared to a reported 36 in 11 schools in 1968-69.² For the 1972-73 year, some 29 or more institutions will offer courses on the Indian. They anticipate having about 90 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions on more than 30 campuses. Some 20 have a recruitment program, and 11 have full-time recruiters. These are ass-

2

This compares to a total of 81 "Indian-related" courses found in California universities, colleges, junior colleges, and private colleges, with 28, 43, none, and 10 respectively, in 1969 by Horace Spencer and Carmen Christy (Far West Lab.) Almost all these courses, they found, were in anthropology departments.

isted by 18 part-time recruiters.

The majority of the students are dependent on the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) financial support. A total of 399 were reported to be receiving EOP or EOG grants, and 576 were reported to be receiving BIA assistance. Only 50 were reported to be enrolled on work-study, 15 to have tribal scholarships, and 45 to be partly dependent on parents for support for college. Some 32 were reported to be working outside the colleges to help support themselves.³

But despite the impressive growth in numbers of Indian students, faculty, support services, curriculum, and budget, the total commitment of the institutions of higher education to the Indian student is not nearly adequate to meet the needs of the Indian people of the state of California. Of the estimated 150,000 Indian people in the state, both native Californian Indians and recent immigrants to the state, the total expected admissions total for Fall 1972 (2400) represents only 1.6% of the population, while the comparable figure for the state as a whole is near 9%. The Indian population is still only at 15% of parity with the rest of the state. The total budget represents about .2% of the combined budgets of the University of California and the State University and College system.

3
The information in this paragraph is largely based on incomplete survey data. Financial support, as well as dropout rates and reasons, need to be researched much more thoroughly. It appears, however, that the amounts of money from the state and federal governments allocated for the disadvantaged is helping Indians very little.

II. THE INDIAN STUDENT: RECRUITMENT, SUPPORT, SUCCESS

In 1967-68 there were some 92 students in institutions of higher learning in the state of California who identified themselves or were identified as Native American Indians. At that time, the Indian student population was minute, in relation to the total Indian population or to the whole state population. Compared to the Indian population of more than 100,000, it was less than .1%. And owing to the recency of the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), even this modest number represented an increase from the recent past.

In the Fall of 1972, the Indian student population will approach or surpass some 2400 students. (See Appendix II) And with the increase in the Indian student population has come some recognition by college officials of the inappropriateness of the "standard" Europeanized curriculum for the special intellectual, cultural, and social needs of the Native American. Unfortunately, the rapid growth of student enrollment has apparently outrun the ability of the higher educational structure as a whole to change to meet the needs of this new class of student, one whom the administrators as a body admit they scarcely know.

As a result, the rapid growth, which may continue for some time into the future, has caught the typical college teacher and administrator unready to deal with the problems brought to them by a culturally different people. They have little conception of the desires of the Indian student regarding curriculum standards and development,

supportive services, social life, and intellectual stimulation while the student is in school, and even less knowledge of the realities of life for the Native American, knowledge which would give them an understanding of the meaning of "foreign" education for the Indian. But with their limited insight into the special problems of the Native American, they have, in some cases, trusted the ability of Native Americans to develop, teach, plan, and evaluate curriculum and programs for the Indian student. In no small number of cases, it has been the Indian student alone who has made his own way through the academic morass, developing, guiding, and with sponsorship, even teaching, classes labelled in general "Native American Studies."

But this new growth is not without its anticipation among the Native American community. There have been plans and ideas for Native American studies, and a special college for Native Americans in California, for at least 15 years. It remained for the events of the past five years to make these ideas into a dimly seen reality.

These ideas started becoming reality in 1968-69. Through the advent of the newly created Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), a handful of Indian students started coming into the colleges and universities. From this handful, 92 or thereabouts in 1967-68, came more in 1968-69 -- about 151 in some 17 institutions. The bulk of the students in 1967-68 came from two schools, both with high percentages of Indians in their communities --

Humboldt State College at Arcata with 40, and Fresno City College with 25. The data for this survey show students at 10 schools, and there were probably less than 15 schools with Indian students. The total of 92 for the year is fairly accurate.

The breakdown for 1968-69 shows that California State College at Long Beach, with some 13 Indian students, was added to the list of schools with significant numbers of Indian students. Humboldt and Fresno both increased, and California State Polytechnic College at San Luis Obispo increased its student Indian enrollment from 7 to 9.

The Berkeley campus of the University of California, the Davis campus, Ohlone College in Fremont, Sacramento State College, San Francisco State College, and Contra Costa College in San Pablo, all admitted enough Indian students in 1969-70 to bring the total for the state to 388 (more or less; some schools apparently started keeping track of Indian students during this year; see footnote 4). Altogether, of the 55 campuses surveyed, 24 reported having Indian students in 1969-70, seven of them for the first time.

The rate of growth almost doubled again in 1970-71.

A total of 725 Indian students were reported from 29 schools

4

Individual figures stand to be inaccurate for several reasons: (1) of the schools surveyed, 10 were omitted from the final tabulations because of inability to gather information or some other reason, (2) some of the 10 were surveyed, then omitted because of scarcity of information, (3) some figures and totals throughout the report are inaccurate because they are based on student census information, notoriously high for "Native Americans, (4) schools suddenly start keeping records.

in that academic year, with new additions being Alameda College, Chico, a doubling at Davis, some at Hayward and Cal State Los Angeles, UCLA suddenly appearing with 99, Northridge campus of the State College system with 17, Sacramento State increasing 150% to 50, Cal State San Bernardino appearing with 19, and Stanford with 25.

In 1971-72, the last year for which figures with any degree of reliability are available, the total student enrollment for Indians again more than doubled, to 1765 in some 42 or more different institutions. Appearing for the first time are Cabrillo College, West Valley in Campbell, Southwestern, Columbia Junior, Grossmont with 25, Cal State Fresno with 28, Irvine increasing to 11, UC San Diego to 16, Cal State Long Beach to 63, UCLA to 168, Diablo Valley suddenly to 56, Sacramento City to 66, Cal State San Diego to 35, Contra Costa to 55, and Santa Rosa Junior College from 2 to 137. The increase at Santa Rosa was largely due to the the very effective advocacy of the Financial Aids Officer, the first Native American in the state apparently to hold such a position. Stanford Indian student enrollment increased from 20 to 45.

The projected enrollment for all 42 colleges for Fall 1972 is expected to be about 2400 -- 2021 for the 42 schools included in this survey, and about 300 or more for the 10 schools not included in this survey. The estimate of 2400 should be within 5% of the actual total; the only possible error would be that it is too low, and that some of the institutions which have not so far admitted

Native Americans would suddenly do so, and increase the total. It seems unlikely that any of the schools which have recently admitted Native American students would recant, and squeeze out its new students, or additions thereto. (Ten of the 42 institutions polled did not report an expected enrollment for Native Americans for Fall 1972; the figure of 2400 is arrived at by keeping their 1971-72 enrollment constant and adding it to the total for the other 32 schools.)

Of the 12 institutions reporting on the number of years of operation of some kind of Indian student program, five reported only one year's experience, indicating that it will still be some few years before their successes or failures can be measured. Four schools reported being in operation for two years, two reported three years, and one school reported having an Indian program in operation for five years.

Even though only 24 school officials reported an estimated dropout rate, and even though even accurate dropout rates are poor indicators over the short term, they will be reported here. Over half of those reporting (14) reported dropout rates ranging from 10% to 29%, a very low rate. However, only 8 of the 14 could give specific figures; the dropout rate given was an estimate at best. Three schools reported rates ranging from 30% to 49%, and two of these could cite specific figures. Six schools reported rates ranging from 50% to 69%, but only one could give specific figures. One school rep-

orted a dropout rate of 90%, but could not give specific figures, and also had only 17 students enroll in the 1971-72 academic year.

Of the schools reporting specific dropout figures, 11 reported a total of 104 students out of 681 enrolled had dropped out, an overall rate of 15.3%. But five of the 11 had only had any kind of Indian student program for one year, and were probably low, or below the figures for the long term. Two stated they had no special programs for Indian students, two had been in operation for two years, one for three years, and one for five years. Thus, for various reasons, it appears that the low overall rate reported from the specific figures is overly optimistic.

Twenty of the 55 schools polled stated that they had an active recruitment program for Native Americans, with no recruitment effort being found at the other 35 schools. Of the 20, 11 indicated that they had a full-time recruiter for Native Americans, and 18 reported that they had part-time recruiters. Seventeen reported that they had some type of orientation program for incoming new students, and it is generally included in the EOP program orientation.

Indian parents are able to provide financial support to only a very small percentage of their children. Four schools reported only 45 students receiving any financial support from parents, while 17 schools reported 399 students receiving support from EOP, and 24 schools reported 576 students receiving support of some kind from BIA.

Fifteen were receiving tribal support, 50 were enrolled in the College Work Study program, and only 32 were reported to working outside the school. (This last figure is doubtless influenced by the BIA policy of actively discouraging Indian students from doing any work outside the school during their first year, coupled with the fact that many of the students were in their first year.) Other sources -- private scholarships, NDSL loans, GI Bill -- provided some support for 23 students.

BIA and EOP are also the most pervasive sources of support as seen by the number of campuses reporting their use. Of the 33 out of 42 schools which provided some data on financial support, BIA was reported at 26 of them, and EOP at 23. Work Study was reported from 17, tribal scholarships from 10, outside work from 9, parents from six, and other sources from eight.

Intuitively, the school officials reporting in this survey felt that the major reasons the Native American students dropped out were, in order, lack of adequate finances, failure to make an adequate cultural adjustment to the school, lack of support or encouragement from school officials, and other uncategorizable reasons, usually personal. When asked to rank the above named reasons, plus lack of support or encouragement from the home, financial reasons were ranked in the top half of a scale from one to six by 12 schools, and only once in the bottom half. Cultural reasons were rated in the top half 11 times, and only twice in the bottom half. Lack of

support from school officials was ranked in the top half nine times, and three times in the bottom half. "Other" reasons, mostly personal as it turned out, were ranked in the top half eight times, and in the bottom half three times. Failure to maintain grades was not an important factor, ranking fifth with six replies in the top half, and four in the bottom half. The home was not thought to be an obstacle to student success by most of the officials; five rated it third out of six, and three ranked it in the bottom half.

Of course, this intuitive survey of reasons for the dropout is only the roughest type of indicator, and has little validity or reliability. It will hopefully be followed by more concise, better-documented studies.

III BUDGETS: WHAT SHARE DOES THE INDIAN GET?

The total budget set aside for Indian curriculum in 1967 was, apparently, only \$11,000; one school accounted for the whole total. In 1967-68, and also again in 1968-69. In 1969-70, however, the picture had changed. Six schools had a total of \$125,832 set aside for Indian faculty, curriculum development, counseling salaries, and so on. The largest of these was the Davis campus, with \$50,000. UC Berkeley, Cal State Long Beach, Sacramento State, Sonoma State, and San Francisco State also had fledgling Native American Studies programs started.

The total for 1970-71 jumped to \$489,711 in nine different schools, with the largest being UCLA. Berkeley,

Humboldt with a federally-funded Indian Teacher Education Project, and the UC Davis Campus all had substantial budgets. The other five were small, however.

The 1971-72 budget jumped again, to \$1,047,500, in 19 schools reporting. Of this total, however, at least \$185,500 went to support projects other than classroom salaries; of the 19 schools reporting budget figures, only 12 reported also having any Indian curriculum. The other seven reported no Indian classroom program. The largest non-classroom budget went to the American Indian Cultural Program at UCLA, and was about \$150,000. The balance of the sum went for recruiting, counseling, administration, and so on. Four schools reported some sort of "department" with no special budget set aside to support it.

Most of the budget support came from the school's annual budget. But some \$390,000 came from the federal government to fund various projects. The Indian Teacher Education Project received \$174,287, Columbia Junior College received \$60,000 for a Forestry Management training program (since discontinued), and Laney College received \$100,000 to train mental health aides. The research unit at UCLA received some \$60,000 in federal funds. Only UCLA received any money from foundations, and this was small -- about \$10,000. It thus appears that federal monies available for development in the humanities, for curriculum development in special programs, and several others, are not coming to California. Some 23 institutions reported some money set aside for Indian programs.

IV. NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES: DEPARTMENTS AND STAFF

From one small subsection of a department in one school five years ago, the Indian-oriented curriculum has grown to include 18 department of Native American Studies, of varying visibility and depth. Three are degree-granting departments, but three others are housed in La Raza Studies, Afro-American Studies, and General Studies departments. One is only a research unit, and one is certificate-granting, similar to a minor program. Two are only in the planning stages, and both anticipate implementation in the 1972-73 academic year. Two are on the same campus.

When asked why these departments and/or Indian classes were started, officials at 12 schools gave as a reason pressure from the Indian students. Another 12 (some, of course, gave both reasons) gave as a reason pressure from the community. The "goodness of the school" was given as a reason by eight of those responding, and seven said that anticipation of pressure from Indians was a reason. Seven also gave other reasons.

Of the departments, three are specialized, i. e., give classes in only one specific area, and 15 are of a general nature. Altogether, they offered in 1971 some 183 classes in Native American Studies; all schools reporting (42) reported a total of 210 Indian-oriented classes in 29 schools. But there is tremendous variety in the depth of the classes offered, and in the kind of classes. UC Berkeley offers some 28 classes in a full degree-granting department, but seven of the 29 reported having only one

Indian class. Davis, Eureka, Chico, Hayward, Sacramento State, and Long Beach all have a fairly wide variety of classes. Davis, Berkeley, and Sacramento State grant degrees in Native American Studies, and Long Beach grants a certificate. The Indian Teacher Education Project at Humboldt will soon graduate its first class of Indian teachers.

On the whole, with little financial support apparently, several schools have come up with substantial programs in Native American Studies. This growth has been concurrent with, and largely as a result of, the rapid increase in the number of Indian students on the campuses. In 1968, for example, there were only 36 Indian-oriented classes, other than anthropology courses, on 11 campuses, and 31 campuses apparently had no Indian classes.

The projected number of Indian classes for 1972-73 is 278, at 29 different institutions. Three or four schools indicated that they might have classes in addition to this total, where none exist now, if they could succeed in having qualified faculty hired.

The number of teachers of Indian studies has risen just as dramatically. From a total of 11 full-time equivalent positions in 1968 (at seven schools) the total in 1971-72 was about 54½ FTE's at 25 institutions. And for 1972-73, the same 25 schools indicate that they anticipate 89 and 5/6 FTE's, and two additional schools did not know if they would get the teachers they wanted.

Twelve of the schools reported sponsoring some 18 conferences, meetings, and workshops which had Indian education as the central theme. UC Davis has been the most active in this area, having sponsored related events.

Five schools reported some friction between Indian students and Indian staff serious enough to warrant concern. Two reported that the teachers were not militant enough to suit the students, one reported that the teachers were too political, and one reported that political intrigue of various kinds caused friction. One reported that the students wanted to take advantage of the Indian teachers -- to get easy grades -- and that friction developed when the teachers would not give out "easy" grades. Another reported that an Indian teacher had expected more work from the Indian students than he had from non-Indian.

V. AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This report stopped short of any explanation, and for good reason. The resources and time available to gather and analyze the information were not enough to go further.

But there are several areas that need further investigation. One is the dropout rate. As stated earlier, one feels intuitively that the dropout rate is much higher than this report would indicate. But the reasons for the dropouts are both more interesting and more vital to the success of Indian students in general than establishing accurate figures. Are the schools with Indian-oriented curriculum more successful in graduating Indian students than

schools who have no such special programs? What effect does the academic background of the student have? Do special tutoring and counseling programs lower dropouts significantly? What reasons do the students who dropped out give? What would motivate them to stay in school? Is the education they are offered perceived as relevant to their plans for their future? Will a whiteman's education close doors at home for them? What difference does academic standing make?

Another area of special study is the skills needed on California Indian reservations, and in California Indian communities. The Indian Teacher Education Project is one program in the state aimed at a very crucial problem in Indian education -- the alienation of the young Indian child from the classroom. But there are other areas of concern, areas in which specific skills are needed, from forestry management to hydrology, and a state-level plan could be worked out with adequate commitment.

Basic is the documentation of the educational needs of the Indian population of the state as a whole. At this time it appears that much less than 2% of the Indian population has finished college, and the figure could easily be less than 1%. Many adults need further education, and would possibly undertake such if they were financially able. The adult educational needs, with the exception of one school, are apparently getting little notice.

Altogether, the growth of the past five years has been rapid, but it is not enough. The gains of the past few years must be consolidated, and assessments made. The Indian has a long way to go to reach parity with the rest of the nation.

APPENDIX I: ARRIVING AT THE FIGURES

The total number of students estimated for 1971-72 is probably high. One factor would overestimate the total, and one factor would underestimate, but by not as much.

The total of 1765 from 42 schools includes five schools whose totals are compiled from student census figures. Such figures from census cards passed out to the student body, usually in the fall quarter, rely on the interpretation and honesty of the students. In addition, such compilations are never complete; the usual return is 40-60%. The most common source of error seems to be, in arriving at the Native American Indian total, that the "newer" term "Native American," as used on many census cards, confuses many students. Many who have always thought of themselves as "Native Americans," even though their race might be Caucasian, Black, or Oriental, respond to the Native American category. San Jose State, on the basis of such a survey, reported that it enrolled 253 Indian students. A check of this list of students who checked "Native American" revealed only six who confirmed that they were Native American Indians.

Some of the totals come from the records of the EOP office on the campus, and these totals sometimes report the number of students they intend to serve, rather than the number actually served. The reason is that the school's portion of EOP (and Upward Bound, Talent Search, and Special Services, if existing) funds is based on the projected estimate of the number of economically disadvantaged students the program will serve. It is thus to the school's, or the program's, advantage, to overestimate; the larger the

number of students served, the larger the funding.

Some of the totals come from administration officials, and are only educated guesses.

Some of the schools polled were not included in the final tabulation, either because of lack of information or sparsity of information. But with the lack of these, it was apparent in interviews that they would account for no more than about 300 students; the fudge factor of 379 was added to the total of 2021 to come up with an estimate of 2400 for 1972-73.

Only 32 of the 42 schools included reported an estimate for 1972-73. To get the total, the number of students from the previous year was included for the ten schools not reporting.

The total amount for budget is low. Some of the schools polled and not included in the final total do have faculty, recruitment, counseling, and other positions set aside for the Native American, and their inclusion would have increased the total budget by perhaps as much as \$500,000. But for the state as a whole, this would still mean that only .3% of the University and State College budget is set aside for Native American positions and programs.

In inquiring about Indian-oriented classes, in general, no attempt was made to include all Indian-oriented classes. For instance, some anthropology classes could possibly be classed as Indian-oriented, but some, such as ethnology and field classes, were not classed as being "Indian-oriented."

There is another possible source of error, one which could be, but is not felt to be, much greater than those already mentioned. That is the fact that all California universities and colleges were not surveyed or polled. The method used in arriving at the list of schools was analogous to the inductive; lists of schools with Indian students from BIA records, records of other organizations, and similar sources were combined to come up with a working list. Then each one of these schools, when contacted, was asked to give lead information on the other schools in its area. Some schools with Indian students could have been, and no doubt were, omitted. But it is safe to assume that they would not change the totals significantly -- at least less than 10% of error.

There is no claim for completeness in the list of staff people; it is at best a working list.

	STUDENTS ENROLLED										BUDGET		
	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971		
Alameda College	30	--	--	--	(18)	(41)	--	--	--	--	--		
Cabrillo College	0	--	--	--	--	12	--	--	--	--	--		
Humboldt State	40	50	(75)	(125)	(200)	--	--	--	--	101,711	190,000		
UC Berkeley	3	5	30	50	66	80	--	--	37,332	102,000	140,000		
West Valley	0				2								
Chico State													
Southwestern	0				9						50,000		
Columbia Junior	0				32	45				100,000	200,000		
UC Davis	0	4	19	39	50	60							
Grossmont	0				25	40					20,000		
College of Redwoods	0				95	125							
Fresno City	25	32	30	41	50								
Fresno State	0		(40)	(35)	28	53					5,000		
Ohlone College	0				(30)	35							
Cal State Fullerton	0	5	8	11	17	28							
Cal State Hayward	2	2	4	7	10	21					9,000		
UC Irvine	0			1	11	25							
UC San Diego	2	3	3	5	16	30							
Cal State L. Beach	0	13	13	25	63	60			2,500	5,000	23,000		
Cal State L. A.	0			23	30	57					(150,000)		
UCLA	0			99	168	250			?	125,000	125,000		
Mesa College	0				3								
Leney College	0				3								
Diablo Valley	0				56								
UC Riverside	0	5	10	8	17	37			11,000	11,000	25,000		
Sonoma State	--				40	65					8,000		
Cal State S. Fernand.	0		3	17	30	48				15,000	25,000		
Sacramento State	0		20	50	162	120							
Sacramento City	0				(66)								
Cal State San Bern.	0			19	13								
Cal State San Diego	0		1	3	35	100					25,000		

(Table continued on next page)

(Figures enclosed in brackets are suspicious)

	STUDENTS ENROLLED										BUDGET			
	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971			
Cal State S.F.	2	4	35	30	25	20			10,000	10,000				
Cal State Poly, S.L.C.	7	9	11	13	15	25								
Contra Costa College	?		(39)	?	55	65								
UC Santa Barbara	5	4	5	6	8	6					1,500			
UC Santa Cruz	0	1	7	10	20	40								
Santa Rose JC	0	2	3	2	(137)									
Stanford	2	2	3	25	45	65					20,000			
Lassen Junior	0		10	14	20	25					2,000			
Stanislaus State	?			12	12	12			3,000	3,000				
College of S. Mateo	4	4	5	5	11	5								
Canada College	0	6	6	20	20	20								
TOTALS	92/10	151/17	388/24	725/29	1765/42	2021/42	11,000/1	11,000/1	125,832/6	489,711/9	1,047,500/1			

	INDIAN CLASSES 1968	INDIAN CLASSES 1971	INDIAN CLASSES 1972
STAFF * DROPOUTS RATE	11/49	21	
College of Alameda	f(1)		
Cabrillo	o(1), a(1)		
Humboldt	a2, f3	10	12
UC Berkeley	f4, e1	25	43
West Valley	o(1)		
Chico	f(1)	50	
Southwestern			1
Columbia	c(1)	15	
UC Davis	r1, f3, c1, f(2)	2	30
Grossmon	c2, f(1)	53	2
Redwoods		21	24
Ohlone			30
Fresno City	f(1)	15	3
Fresno State	c1, f(1)	20	10
Fullerton	c(2), c1		3
Hayward	f1, f(2), c1	8	15
UC Irvine	c1, c(1)		18
UC San Diego	c2	50	
Long Beach	f4, c1	20	1
Cal St te Los Angeles	c2, c(1)	25	12
UCLA	o3, o(1)	17	9
Napa	f(1)		
Laney	a(1), f(1)		
Diablo	c(1), f(2)		2
Canada			
UCR	c1	90	
Sonoma	f1	10	7
CSS Fernando	r(1)	50	1
Sac State	f5, f(1)	30	14
Sac City	f(1)		1
CSS Bernardino	c(1)		
CSSD	f(2), c1	15	2
CSSF	f(2), c1, f1	30	5
San Luis Obispo	c2		1
DSM		50	
Contra Costa	f(2), c(1)		
UCSE	c1	20	8
UCSC	r(1) c(1) o2	50	2
SHJC	fe1	10	3
SU	e1	30	2
Lassen Jr. College	f1		1
Stanislaus	f(1)		4
TOTALS	104/681	36/11	210/29 278/29

* Staff symbols:

f - faculty
r - recruiter
c - counselor
fa - financial aids
a - administration
o - other

Staff totals follow symbols: i.e.,
f2 means two full time faculty
members; f(2) means two parttime
faculty members, etc.

APPENDIX III: Reasons for Dropouts

	Financial Reasons	The Home	School Officials	Grades	Cultural Reasons	Other
1	9	0	5	2	3	7
2	3	0	2	4	6	1
3	0	5	2	2	2	0
4	0	1	1	3	1	0
5	0	2	2	1	1	0
6	1	0	0	0	0	3
TOTALS	13	8	12	14	13	11

APPENDIX IV: Staff totals

	Part-time	Full-time
Faculty	20	26
Recruiters	1	2
Counselors	5	20
Financial Aids	0	3
Administrators	6	4
Other	3	1
	<u>35</u>	<u>56</u>